UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,677	06/19/2008	Richard A. Bond	8077-003-US	1754
32301 7590 06/16/2011 CATALYST LAW GROUP, APC			EXAMINER	
5694 Mission C		BORI, IBRAHIM D		
#519 SAN DIEGO, CA 92108			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/16/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/574,677	BOND, RICHARD A.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	IBRAHIM D. BORI	1629				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 Ju	ne 2008.					
·— · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
<i>,</i> —						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4) Claim(s) 1-8,16-21,25-27,40,41,49,57,65,73,84,92 and 99 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.</li> <li>7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8) Claim(s) 1-8,16-21,25-27,40-41,49,57,65,73,84,92 and 99 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>						
Attachment(s)	a) 🗖 1-1i 0	(DTO 412)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Wail Data	5) Notice of Informal P					
S. Patent and Trademark Office						

Application/Control Number: 10/574,677 Page 2

Art Unit: 1629

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - Group I. Claims 1-8, 16-21, 25-26, 40-41, 49, 57, 65, 73, 84 and 92 drawn to a method for treatment of pulmonary airway disease in a subject suffering from pulmonary airway disease comprising administering a therapeutic amount of a β-adrenergic inverse agonist to the subject to treat the pulmonary airway disease, and a therapeutically effective amount of an additional agent selected from the group consisting of: a β<sub>2</sub>-selective adrenergic agonist; a steroid; an anticholinergic drug; a xanthine compound; an anti-lgE antibody; a leukotriene modifier; and a phosphodiesterase inhibitor in order to treat the pulmonary airway disease, classified in class 424, subclass various.
  - Group II. Claim 27 and 99, drawn to a pharmaceutical composition comprising: (a) nadolol in a quantity selected from the group consisting of 1 mg, m mg, 5 mg, 10 mg, 15 mg, 30 mg 50 mg, and 70 mg; and (b) a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, and a pharmaceutical composition comprising:

Application/Control Number: 10/574,677 Page 3

Art Unit: 1629

(a) a therapeutically effective amount of a  $\beta$ -adrenergic inverse agonist;

- (b) a therapeutically effective amount of a second therapeutic agent effective to treat a pulmonary airway disease, the second therapeutic agent being selected from the group consisting of a  $\beta_2$ -selective adrenergic agonist, a steroid, an anticholinergic drug, a xanthine compound, an anti-IgE antibody, a leukotriene modifier, and a phosphodiesterase IV; and
- (c) a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, classified in class 424, subclass various.

Groups I is directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. The process for forming each of the products in the groups, form different products and start with different compounds. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Group II is directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a

Art Unit: 1629

materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. In the instant case, the structures in each group differ in chemical structure, reactivity and use. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Groups I and II, and permutations of, are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, analogs of cedax (ceftibuten) can be used for treating pulmonary or respiratory diseases.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process Application/Control Number: 10/574,677

Art Unit: 1629

claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Page 5

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;

(c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

## Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species listed in claims: 2, 4-5, 7, 16, 18, 40-41, 49, 57, 65, 84 and 92.

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to **elect a single disclosed species** for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would

not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable

over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

No matter which group Applicants elect, Applicants are required to elect a single, specific chemical compound encompassed by the generic formula of the corresponding group (*e.g.*, if Applicants elect Group I, any single specific compounds recited by claim 1 would constitute a proper species election); Note: Applicants should identify the elected compound using proper chemical nomenclature and provide the chemical structure.

A telephone call was not made because of the complex nature of the claims. Please see MPEP 812.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

# Time for Reply

Applicant is reminded that 1-month (not less than 30 days) shortened statutory period will be set for reply when a written requirement is made without an action on the merits. This period may be extended under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Such action will not be an "action on the merits" for purposes of the second action final program. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

### Correction of Inventorship

Applicants are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to IBRAHIM D. BORI whose telephone number is (571)270-7020. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00AM-5:00PM(EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JEFFREY S. LUNDGREN can be reached on 571-272-5541. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/574,677 Page 10

Art Unit: 1629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/IBRAHIM D BORI/ Examiner, Art Unit 4131

/Jeffrey S. Lundgren/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1629